

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**JUL 08 2005**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of	)	Examiner: Rinchart, K.B.
	)	Art Unit: 3749
<b>DOBIE, DARRYL &amp; CHERYL</b>	)	
	)	<b>AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE</b>
	)	<b>TO OFFICE ACTION</b>
Filed: April 20, 2004	)	
	)	
Serial No. 10/828,743	)	
	)	
For: <b>NOISE ATTENUATING DRYING</b>	)	
<b>APPARATUS FOR MOTOR</b>	)	
<b>VEHICLES</b>	)	

Hon. Commissioner of Patents  
and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed March 15, 2005, Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 13, 14 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Snyder. Claims 1 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hull. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morrison. Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gadefait et al. Claims 2-6 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hull. Claims 7 and 21 were allowed and claims 11 and 20 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form and including the base claim and any intervening claims.

**REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the allowance of Claims 7 and 21 and the indication that claims 11 and 20 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form and including the base claim and any